

December 20, 2012

Project No. 04-01-101-001

Mr. Michael Friend, P.E.
Staff Engineer III
Special Projects Branch
Bureau of Corrective Actions
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
2030 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 230
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-0818

Re: Titanium Metals Corporation

Henderson, Nevada Facility NDEP Facility ID # 000537

2012 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, Response to NDEP's November 20, 2012

Comments

Dear Mr. Friend:

Please find attached TIMET's response to the NDEP's November 20, 2012 comments on the 2012 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report for the Titanium Metals Corporation (TIMET) facility. This document has been authored by Ms. Candy Friday with CdFriday & Associates and myself.

If you have any questions regarding this submittal, please do not hesitate to contact me at (702) 563-0600.

Sincerely,

BROADBENT & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Kirk J. Stowers, EM-1549 (exp. 10/11/14)

Associate Geologist

JURAT: I, Kirk J. Stowers, hereby certify that I am responsible for the services described in this document and for the preparation of this document. The services described in this document have been provided in a manner consistent with the current standards of the profession and to the best of my knowledge comply with all applicable federal, state and local statutes, regulations and ordinances.

cc: Kevin Lombardozzi – TIMET, hard copy and on disk

Victoria Tyson-Bloyd - Tyson Contracting, Inc., hard copy and on disk

Shannon Harbour, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Carson City, Nevada, on disk

BMI Compliance Coordinator, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Las Vegas, Nevada, hard copy and on disk

Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, c/o McGinley and Associates, Inc., 815 Maestro Drive, Reno, Nevada 89511, hard copy only

Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, c/o McGinley and Associates, Inc., 6280 South Valley View Boulevard, Suite 604, Las Vegas, Nevada 89118, hard copy and on disk

Jeff Gibson - AMPAC, by electronic mail

Mark Paris - BMI, by electronic mail

Lee Farris – BMI, by electronic mail

Ranajit Sahu – BMI, by electronic mail

Joe Kelly – Montrose, by electronic mail

Paul Sundberg – representing Montrose, by electronic mail

Jay Steinberg – NERT, by electronic mail

Allan DeLorme - NERT, by electronic mail

John Pekala - NERT, by electronic mail

Curt Richards - Olin, by electronic mail

Jay Gear - Olin, by electronic mail

Ed Modiano – OSSM GWTS, by electronic mail

Chuck Elmendorf - Stauffer, by electronic mail

Nick Pogoncheff - Stauffer, by electronic mail

George Crouse -Syngenta, by electronic mail

Enoe Marcum – WAPA, by electronic mail

Attachment A - TIMET Response

1. Figure 2-1 and 2-2, please present and discuss these figures in Section 3.0 in the next report. Currently, these figures are provided without any discussion in the Deliverable.

TIMET Response: TIMET agrees to present and discuss these figures in Section 3.0 of the next annual report.

2. Section 3.2.1, page 3-4 and related sections on the cation-anion balance (CAB), NDEP provides the following comments:

TIMET Response: As a general response, TIMET proposes to discuss CAB and TDS evaluations on an event-specific basis instead of a combined annual basis to enhance clarity. Tables will also be separated by event for reference.

a. Section 3.2.1, Page 3-4, well CLDR-1 was referenced as not meeting 5% CAB criterion; NDEP notes that this statement is accurate for the 2nd Semester 2011 (2ndS2011) sampling event. However, Table 3-47 indicates that no sample was collected for the 1st Semester 2012 (1S2012) sampling event, and therefore no CAB evaluation was conducted. Please revise the text to accurately reflect the state of CAB analyses for this well.

TIMET Response: The text in Section 3.2.1, Page 3-4 is accurate as it was originally written. The statement indicates that the 5% CAB criterion was not met for *at least one* of the events during this reporting period. However, in order to clarify the information, the results of the three CAB and TDS evaluations are now discussed by event.

Please see revised text in Section 3.2.1.

b. Section 3.2.1, Page 3-4, wells TPMZ-107 and TPMZ-110 are referenced as not having been evaluated for CAB due to incomplete datasets. However, data is available for one of the two sampling events reported, and CAB evaluation was conducted for these wells. Please revise the text to accurately reflect the state of CAB analyses for these wells.

TIMET Response: The text in Section 3.2.1, Page 3-4 2 was revised to discuss results on an event-specific basis for better clarity. Additional discussion was added to the fourth paragraph in Section 3.2.1 to indicate the reasons why CAB/TDS evaluations are not conducted on some wells. Specifics reasons for each well are given in the event-specific Tables 3-47A and 3-47B.

To address the comment specifically, TMPZ-107 and TMPZ-110 in 2nd Semester, 2011 do not require sampling of a complete set of cations and anions, based on the GW sampling plan (TIMET 2010a). Therefore, evaluations of CAB and TDS are not applicable.

There is currently no requirement to analyze the complete set of cations and anions for every well sampled for any given event in the TIMET GW sampling plan.

Please see revised text in Section 3.2.1 and Tables 3-47A and 3-47B.

c. Section 3.2.1, Page 3-4, states that CAB evaluations were not conducted for several of the wells due to an incomplete data set. Please describe how data sets were determined to be incomplete, discuss the reasons that incomplete data sets were produced, and describe the corrective actions that will be taken to produce complete data sets in the future.

TIMET Response: The GW sampling conducted semi-annually at TIMET is based on an approved GW sampling program (TIMET 2010a). Based on that program, not every well sampled for each semi-annual event is required to have a complete set of cations and anions analyzed. A complete set of cations and anions include four major cations, seven major anions, and TDS. If any one of the 12 analytes is missing, then calculations requiring that analyte are not conducted.

There are currently three reasons why results may not be present for all 39 wells for each sampling event: (1) not all wells require sampling in both semi-annual events, so the reported results may vary between events; (2) not all wells require the analysis of a full suite of cations or anions in both semi-annual events, so calculation is not applicable; and (3) occasionally, a well may not produce sufficient water to analyze all analytes. This information has been added to the fourth paragraph in Section 3.2.1. In addition, the CAB tables (revised Tables 3-47A and 3-47B) have been modified to include a note regarding the status of each well for which a complete set of cations/anions was not available.

At this time, no changes to the GW sampling plan are proposed.

Please see revised text in Section 3.2.1 and revised Tables 3-47A and 3-47B with embedded notes.

d. Table 3-47, the tabulated CAB percent difference, TDS ratio and EC ratio values do not appear to follow the referenced NDEP guidance for use of significant figures. Please review and follow NDEP guidance on this topic for resubmission.

TIMET Response: In preparation for this report, two Excel spreadsheets were combined to form the annual CAB table (Table 3-47). In doing so, some formatting was inadvertently altered. According to NDEP guidance for significant figures, the CAB percent difference, TDS ratio, and EC ratio should be reported to two significant figures. TIMET does not see any TDS ratio incorrectly reported; however, CAB percent differences and EC ratios have been revised on the event-specific tables (now Tables 3-47A and 3-47B).

Please see revised Tables 3-47A and 3-47B.

e. Table 3-47, the formula weights for bicarbonate, fluoride, perchlorate, and sulfate are incorrect in the live spreadsheet. NDEP carried the correct formula weights for the above mentioned anions through the remainder of the calculations and notes that data flags were unchanged. Please update working files for future Deliverables.

TIMET Response: Formula weights for all cations and anions were reviewed by TIMET. As a general rule, TIMET takes the atomic weight of each component directly from the IUPAC Technical Report 2005 periodic table and rounds the final formula weight to 5 significant figures. This yields slightly different values for some species than rounding the original atomic weight to 5 significant figures before calculation of formula weight. TIMET will concede to the later method of starting with atomic weights rounded to 5 significant figures prior to calculating the formula weight. For clarity, calculation of each species identified in the NDEP comment has been included below with an appropriate action listed for each. Please let TIMET know if the corrected formula weights meet NDEP expectations.

Bicarbonate: Bicarbonate alkalinity is reported as $CaCO_3$. As such, the formula weight is calculated as Ca = 40.078, C = 12.011, $3O = 15.999 \times 3 = 47.997$. The sum for $CaCO_3 = 100.09$. The valence for $CaCO_3$ is 2, so the equivalent weight for $CaCO_3$ is 100.09/2, as used in the current Excel spreadsheet formula. No change is proposed for bicarbonate equivalent weight.

Fluoride: Fluoride atomic weight reported is a typographical error and should be 18.998. This error has been corrected and will be correct in future deliverables.

Perchlorate: Perchlorate is reported as ClO_4 . As such the formula weight is calculated as Cl = 35.453. $4O = 15.999 \times 4 = 63.996$. The sum for ClO_4 = 99.449; divided by a valence of 1. TIMET has changed the formula weight used in the Excel spreadsheet for future deliverables from 99.451 to 99.449.

Sulfate: Sulfate is reported as SO_4^{2-} . As such the formula weight is calculated as S = 32.065, $4O = 15.999 \times 4 = 63.996$. The sum for sulfate = 96.064; divided by a valence of 2. TIMET has changed the formula weight used in the Excel spreadsheet for future deliverables from 96.063 to 96.064.

Please see revised Excel spreadsheet of Tables 3-47A and 3-47B.

f. Table 3-47, CAB and associated correctness checks are shown for 2ndS2012 and 1stS2012, however calculations are not provided for 2ndS2012 in the live spreadsheet. Please provide calculations for 2ndS2012.

TIMET Response: The events included in this report are for 2nd Semester, 2011 and 1st Semester, 2012. When combining tables from two sampling events, the raw calculation tables for 2nd Semester, 2011 were not added to the Excel file. Table 3-47 has been divided into two event-specific tables (Tables 3-47A and 3-47B). Each Excel file contains the raw calculations for each event. In addition, text in Section 3.2.1 has been revised to reflect the event-specific tables.

Please see revised Tables 3-47A and 3-47B and text in Section 3.2.1.

g. Table 3-47, samples with incomplete data sets, for which CAB evaluations were not conducted, are qualified in the right hand column as "No qualifier"; this can be misleading. Please change the entry to indicate that analysis was not performed (e.g., "Not qualified").

TIMET Response: Tables 3-47A and 3-47B have been revised to use the phrase "Not qualified" when CAB/TDS evaluations were not conducted.

Please see revised Tables 3-47A and 3-47B.

h. Table 3-47, samples that fail both the CAB check and the TDS ratio and/or EC ratio checks (specifically CLD4-R, MW-5, PC-024, PC-28) should be qualified as R-CAB&TDS. Please revise as necessary.

TIMET Response: TIMET respectfully disagrees with the rejection of data when the CAB and TDS measured/sum are out of acceptance criteria. Scenario number 4 for which rejection is required in the NDEP CAB guidance (NDEP September 28, 2009) states that: Cation-anion balance does not check; TDS measured/sum *AND* TDS:EC ratio does not check. In each case identified in the comment, the TDS:EC ratio was acceptable, so data were simply qualified as estimated for CAB and TDS (scenario numbers 2 and 3) and the qualifiers were combined (J-CAB and J-TDS). In none of the results identified in the comment were all three evaluations unacceptable. TIMET proposes that no changes be made to this portion of Tables 3-47A and 3-47B or qualifiers in the associated database.

 Please note that the above comments may necessitate revision and resubmittal of the related EDD files. Please provide these files once these issues have been resolved.

TIMET Response: As stated in the response to comment 2h, TIMET does not believe that the associated database or NDEP EDD requires revision. As such, no database files were changed or resubmitted.

3. Section 3.2.2., pages 3-5, as NDEP has noted previously, TIMET has presented no information in this Deliverable or to date to support the concept of an off-site plume being the source of contamination. Please provide this information or remove these statements from all future Deliverables.

TIMET Response: As requested, statements of this sort will be removed from future deliverables.

4. Section 3.2.4, page 3-8, TIMET indicates that the PCE plume is stable and well defined. NDEP is not aware of any plume stability calculations that have been completed. In addition, the contours on the presented figures are open and the plume limits are not defined. Please clarify this statement or provide the appropriate calculations and define the limits of the plume in future Deliverables.

TIMET Response: Statements of this sort will be clarified in future deliverables.

5. Section 3.2.4, page 3-8, please remove unsupported statements such as TIMET's conjecture on the source of TTHMs from all future Deliverables. NDEP requires such statements to be supported by data or withdrawn.

TIMET Response: Unsupported statements such as conjecture on the source of TTHMs will not be included in future deliverables.

6. Appendix C, Figure C-34, Uranium, well TIMET MW-5 appears to be demonstrating a trend of increasing concentrations since January 2009. In addition, the concentrations in this well now exceed the USEPA MCL and exceed the historic concentrations presented on this figure. Please discuss this matter in the next report. It is noted that this issue was not discussed in Section 3.2.2 of the Deliverable.

TIMET Response: The trend of increasing uranium concentrations in well TIMET MW-5 will be discussed in the next annual report, if the trend continues.

TIMET. 2010a. "Groundwater Remedial Action Operation and Maintenance Monitoring Sampling and Analysis Plan, TIMET, Henderson, Nevada" February 2010

TABLE 3-47A
CATION-ANION BALANCE EVALUATION FOR 2ND SEMESTER 2011
GROUNDWATER MONITORING REPORT
2ND SEMESTER 2011 AND 15T SEMESTER 2012

	Cation	Anion			TDS	TDS			TDS	E			
	Sum		ā		Measured	Calculated	TDS	TDS	Measured	Measured	EC Ratio	EC	
Well ID	(med/L)	(med/L) ²	(%) ₃	CAB Results	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	Ratio 4	Results ⁵	(mg/L)	(mS/cm)	TDS:EC 6	Results 7	Qualifier
AA-01	28	09	2.1	Acceptable	3600	3600	1.0	Acceptable	3600	5070	0.71	Acceptable	Not qualified
AA-09	85	98	0.78	Acceptable	6100	5200	1.2	Acceptable	6100	7520	0.81	Acceptable	Not qualified
AA-27	61	09	0.47	Acceptable	4300	3700	1.1	Acceptable	4300	4880	0.88	Acceptable	Not qualified
AA-UW1	28	57	1.5	Acceptable	4000	3600	1.1	Acceptable	4000	4680	0.85	Acceptable	Not qualified
BRW-R1	20	51	1.5	Acceptable	3600	3200	1.1	Acceptable	3600	4390	0.82	Acceptable	Not qualified
CLD1-R	47	22	7.7	Unacceptable	3800	3100	1.2	Acceptable	3800	5640	0.67	Acceptable	J-CAB
CLD4-R	77	88	7.1	Unacceptable	5100	5200	66.0	Unacceptable	5100	9910	0.51	Acceptable	J-CAB/J-TDS
CMT-101	Limited cat	Limited cation and anion	n analysis rec	analysis required by groundwa	ater monitoring program	ing program.		NA	5200	8010	0.65	Acceptable	Not qualified
DBMW-1	82	84	1.3	Acceptable	2600	5200	1.1	Acceptable	2600	7620	0.73	Acceptable	Not qualified
DBMW-3	120	130	2.6	Acceptable	8000	7600	1.0	Acceptable	8000	11480	0.70	Acceptable	Not qualified
DBMW-4	81	82	0.86	Acceptable	2300	2000	1.1	Acceptable	5300	0299	0.79	Acceptable	Not qualified
DBMW-5	79	78	0.58	Acceptable	2000	4700	1.1	Acceptable	2000	6500	72.0	Acceptable	Not qualified
EWQAL-12	73	75	1.1	Acceptable	5200	4500	1.2	Acceptable	5200	7280	0.71	Acceptable	Not qualified
J2D1-R2	100	110	4.0	Acceptable	7400	6300	1.2	Acceptable	7400	10570	0.70	Acceptable	Not qualified
J2D2-R2	82	86	2.6	Acceptable	2200	4800	1.2	Acceptable	5700	7670	0.74	Acceptable	Not qualified
J2D4	140	160	6.8	Unacceptable	0086	8700	1.1	Acceptable	9800	14800	99.0	Acceptable	J-CAB
JZUZ	99	72	4.4	Acceptable	4800	4000	1.2	Acceptable	4800	6420	0.75	Acceptable	Not qualified
M-129	Limited cat	ion and anic	n analysis rec	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program	ater monitor	ing program.		NA	2600	09/8	0.64	Acceptable	Not qualified
M-130	Limited cat	ion and anic	n analysis rec	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundwa	ater monitoring program	ing program.		NA	6100	9040	29.0	Acceptable	Not qualified
MW-3R	32	34	3.9	Acceptable	2200	2000	1.1	Acceptable	2200	3380	0.65	Acceptable	Not qualified
MW-4	41	43	2.2	Acceptable	3100	2700	1.2	Acceptable	3100	4050	0.77	Acceptable	Not qualified
MW-5	20	55	4.1	Acceptable	3600	3300	1.1	Acceptable	3600	5160	0.70	Acceptable	Not qualified
MW-6R	39	43	5.0	Acceptable	3000	2500	1.2	Acceptable	3000	4070	0.74	Acceptable	Not qualified
PC-024	70	170	41	Unacceptable	8400	0096	0.87	Unacceptable	8400	15110	0.56	Acceptable	J-CAB/J-TDS
PC-124	110	120	2.7	Acceptable	7900	0069	1.1	Acceptable	7900	10420	0.76	Acceptable	Not qualified
PC-28	37	84	39	Unacceptable	0089	5400	1.2	Acceptable	0089	8480	0.80	Acceptable	J-CAB
PC-54	75	72	2.1	Acceptable	2200	4700	1.2	Acceptable	5700	6280	0.91	Acceptable	Not qualified
PC-67	150	170	5.2	Acceptable	11000	9700	1.1	Acceptable	11000	16560	0.66	Acceptable	Not qualified
POU-3	120	130	1.8	Acceptable	7900	7400	1.1	Acceptable	7900	12070	0.65	Acceptable	Not qualified
TMMW-101	26	28	3.5	Acceptable	1800	1600	1.1	Acceptable	1800	2540	0.71	Acceptable	Not qualified
TMMW-102	Not require	d for sampli	ng by groundy	Not required for sampling by groundwater monitoring pr	program.			NA	Not required	for sampling	by groundw	Not required for sampling by groundwater monitoring program.	program.
TMMW-103	Not require	d for sampli	ng by groundy	Not required for sampling by groundwater monitoring pr	program.		200	NA	Not required	for sampling	by groundw	Not required for sampling by groundwater monitoring program.	program.
TMMW-104	23	24	1.9	Acceptable	1600	1400	1.1	Acceptable	1600	2290	0.70	Acceptable	Not qualified
TMPZ-105	Limited cat	ion and anic	n analysis rec	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program.	ater monitori	ng program.		NA	7700	12600	0.61	Acceptable	Not qualified
	Limited cat	ion and anic	n analysis rec	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program.	ater monitori	ng program.		NA	2200	10330	0.55	Acceptable	Not qualified
TMPZ-107	Limited cat	ion and anic	n analysis rec	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program.	ater monitori	ng program.		NA	15000	25740	0.58	Acceptable	Not qualified

CATION-ANION BALANCE EVALUATION FOR 2ND SEMESTER 2011 2ND SEMESTER 2011 AND 1ST SEMESTER 2012 GROUNDWATER MONITORING REPORT **TABLE 3-47A**

	Cation	Anion			TDS	TDS			TDS	EC			
	Sum	Sum	Difference		Measured	leasured Calculated	TDS	TDS	Measured	Measured	EC Ratio	EC	
<u></u>	(med/L)	(med/L) 5	(%)	CAB Results	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	Ratio 4	Results ⁵	(mg/L)	(uS/cm) TDS:EC 6	TDS:EC 6	Results 7	Qualifier
Z-108	Limited cat	tion and anic	imited cation and anion analysis requirec	by gro	undwater monitoring program	ng program.		NA	14000	22700	0.62	Acceptable	Not qualified

	6670	4900	NA		na program.	ater monitori	ation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program	on analysis re	tion and anic	Limited ca	TMPZ-110 Limited ca
	8340	2200	AN		ng program.	ater monitori	ation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program.	on analysis re	tion and anic	Limited ca	TMPZ-109 Limited ca
	22700	14000	NA		ng program.	ater monitori	ation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program.	on analysis re	tion and anic	Limited o	TMPZ-108
-	(mS/cm)	(mg/L)	Results 5	Ratio 4	(mg/L) Ratio ⁴	(mg/L)	CAB Results (mg/L)	(%)	(meq/L) ² (%) ³	(med/L)	Well ID
ш	Measured	Measured	TDS	TDS	Measured Calculated	Measured		Difference	Sum	Sum	
	EC	TDS			TDS	TDS			Anion	Cation	

Not qualified Not qualified

Acceptable Acceptable

0.68 0.73

Notes:

Milligram per liter	Total dissolved solids	MicroSiemens per centimeter
mg/L	TDS	nS/cm
Cation/anion balance	Electrical conductivity	Milliequivalent per liter
CAB	EC	med/L

- Cations summed include: Calcium, magnesium, sodium, and potassium.
- Anions summed include: Bicarbonate, carbonate, chloride, fluoride, nitrate-nitrogen, perchlorate, and sulfate.
- QC criterion for CAB: absolute percent difference less than or equal to 5 percent; when the anion sum is between 10 and 800 meq/L.
 - Ratio of laboratory measured TDS to calculated TDS.

4

- QC criterion for TDS measured versus calculated: ratio of TDS measured to TDS calculated greater than or equal to 1.0 and less than or equal to 1.2.
 - QC limits for TDS versus ED ratio is 0.54 to 0.96
- J-TDS indicates that TDS value for the given well is estimated; J-CAB indicates that the values for the 11 cation/anions are estimated for a given well.

The qualification of results based CAB includes the "J" qualifier with the associated comment code "p" or "q" in the TIMET analytical database

TABLE 3-47B CATION-ANION BALANCE EVALUATION FOR 1ST SEMESTER 2012 GROUNDWATER MONITORING REPORT 2ND SEMESTER 2011 AND 1ST SEMESTER 2012

	Anion			TDS	TDS			TDS	S			
	Sum	Difference		Measured	Calculated	TDS	TDS	Measured	Measured	EC Ratio	S	
_	(med/L) 2	(%)	CAB Results	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	Ratio 4	Results ⁵	(mg/L)	(mS/cm)	TDS:EC 6	Results 7	Qualifier
71	68	2.1	Acceptable	5700	4400	1.3	Unacceptable	5700	5347	1.1	Unacceptable	J-TDS
Н	68	1.4	Acceptable	6400	5400	1.2	Acceptable	6400	8190	0.78	Acceptable	Not qualified
	62	1.8	Acceptable	4500	3900	1.2	Acceptable	4500	5220	0.86	Acceptable	Not qualified
\Box	57	0.24	Acceptable	4100	3500	1.2	Acceptable	4100	4981	0.82	Acceptable	Not qualified
П	54	4.0	Acceptable	3700	3300	1.1	Acceptable	3700	4340	0.85	Acceptable	Not qualified
Ĕ	groundwate	Insufficient groundwater in well to sample.	mple.				NA	Insufficient g	Insufficient groundwater in well to sample.	n well to san	nple.	AN
Г	06	4.5	Acceptable	0009	5300	1.1	Acceptable	0009	9790	0.61	Acceptable	Not qualified
catic	on and anion	n analysis rec	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundw	ater monitor	rater monitoring program.		AN	5400	8030	0.67	Acceptable	Not qualified
	84	0.40	Acceptable	0009	5200	1.1	Acceptable	0009	7294	0.82	Acceptable	Not qualified
130	130	2.1	Acceptable	9000	8100	1.1	Acceptable	0006	11330	0.79	Acceptable	Not qualified
	77	2.4	Acceptable	2200	4800	1.2	Acceptable	2200	6721	0.85	Acceptable	Not qualified
	92	1.0	Acceptable	5500	4600	1.2	Acceptable	2500	6239	0.84	Acceptable	Not qualified
	71	1.4	Acceptable	5200	4300	1.2	Acceptable	5200	6548	0.79	Acceptable	Not qualified
100	100	06:0	Acceptable	7300	2900	1.2	Acceptable	7300	10670	0.68	Acceptable	Not qualified
80	78	1.7	Acceptable	5800	4500	1.3	Unacceptable	2800	7416	0.78	Acceptable	J-TDS
130	140	1.3	Acceptable	9800	7800	1.3	Unacceptable	0086	15570	0.63	Acceptable	J-TDS
	29	3.1	Acceptable	4900	3900	1.2	Acceptable	4900	6200	0.79	Acceptable	Not qualified
catic	on and anio	n analysis req	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundw	rater monitoring program	ing program.		NA	6100	7640	0.80	Acceptable	Not qualified
catic	on and anio	n analysis rec	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundw	ater monitor	ater monitoring program.		NA	5800	6980	0.83	Acceptable	Not qualified
41	44	3.9	Acceptable	2900	2500	1.2	Acceptable	2900	4330	0.67	Acceptable	Not qualified
55	41	15	Unacceptable	3100	2800	1.1	Acceptable	3100	3640	0.85	Acceptable	J-CAB
41	55	15	Unacceptable	4000	3100	1.3	Unacceptable	4000	4930	0.81	Acceptable	J-CAB/J-TDS
38	41	3.2	Acceptable	2900	2400	1.2	Acceptable	2900	3840	0.76	Acceptable	Not qualified
160	160	0.48	Acceptable	12000	9500	1.3	Unacceptable	12000	15550	0.77	Acceptable	J-TDS
120	120	0.59	Acceptable	8400	. 0089	1.2	Acceptable	8400	10830	0.78	Acceptable	Not qualified
83	75	5.2	Unacceptable	7000	2000	1.4	Unacceptable	7000	7809	06.0	Acceptable	J-CAB/J-TDS
59	62	2.2	Acceptable	4300	3700	1.2	Acceptable	4300	6395	0.67	Acceptable	Not qualified
150	160	2.2	Acceptable	12000	9200	1.3	Unacceptable	12000	15710	0.76	Acceptable	J-TDS
89	91	1.5	Acceptable	6400	5500	1.2	Acceptable	6400	8674	0.74	Acceptable	Not qualified
26	28	3.7	Acceptable	2000	1700	1.2	Acceptable	2000	2643	0.76	Acceptable	Not qualified
16	17	3.8	Acceptable	1200	930	1.3	Unacceptable	1200	1639	0.73	Acceptable	J-TDS
33	34	0.86	Acceptable	2400	2000	1.2	Acceptable	2400	3180	0.75	Acceptable	Not qualified
	32	3.1	Acceptable	2400	1900	1.2	Acceptable	2400	2810	0.85	Acceptable	Not qualified
100	110	7.	Acceptable	7900	6400	1.2	Acceptable	7900	11140	0.71	Acceptable	Not qualified
catic	on and anion	n analysis req	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundw	ate	ing program.		NA	5500	8702	0.63	Acceptable	Not qualified
230	250	3.2	Acceptable	16000	14000	1.2	Acceptable	16000	23970	0.67	Acceptable	Not qualified
d catic	on and anion	n analysis req	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundwater monitoring program	ater monitor	ing program.		NA	14000	19000	0.74	Acceptable	Not qualified
d catic	on and anion	n analysis req	Limited cation and anion analysis required by groundw	ater monitor	rater monitoring program.		NA	0009	7922	92'0	Acceptable	Not qualified
100												

Notes:

Cation/anion balance Electrical conductivity Milliequivalent per liter CAB EC meq/L

Milligram per liter Total dissolved solids MicroSiemens per centimeter mg/L TDS uS/cm

CATION-ANION BALANCE EVALUATION FOR 1ST SEMESTER 2012 2ND SEMESTER 2011 AND 1ST SEMESTER 2012 **GROUNDWATER MONITORING REPORT**

Notes (continued):

- QC criterion for CAB: absolute percent difference less than or equal to 5 percent; when the anion sum is between 10 and 800 meq/L. Cations summed include: Calcium, magnesium, sodium, and potassium. Anions summed include: Bicarbonate, carbonate, chloride, fluoride, nitrate-nitrogen, perchlorate, and sulfate.
 - Ratio of laboratory measured TDS to calculated TDS.
- 2 8 4 5 9 7
- OC criterion for TDS measured versus calculated: ratio of TDS measured to TDS calculated greater than or equal to 1.0 and less than or equal to 1.2. QC criterion for TDS wersus ED ratio is 0.54 to 0.96
 J-TDS indicates that TDS value for the given well is estimated; J-CAB indicates that the values for the 11 cation/anions are estimated for a given well. The qualification of results based CAB includes the "J" qualifier with the associated comment code "p" or "q" in the TIMET analytical database